

On constant factor approximation for earth mover distance over doubling metrics

Shi Li

Dept. of Computer Science
Princeton University
35 Olden Street
Princeton, NJ, 08540
shili@cs.princeton.edu

February 9, 2010

Abstract

Given a metric space (X, d_X) , the earth mover distance between two distributions over X is defined as the minimum cost of a bipartite matching between the two distributions. The doubling dimension of a metric (X, d_X) is the smallest value α such that every ball in X can be covered by 2^α ball of half the radius. A metric (or a sequence of metrics) is called doubling precisely if its doubling dimension is bounded. We study the efficient algorithms for approximating earth mover distance over doubling metrics.

Our first result is a near linear time (in the size of the X) algorithm for estimating EMD over doubling metric X , with a $O(\alpha_X)$ approximation ratio, where α_X is the doubling dimension of X . Given a metric (X, d_X) , we can use $\tilde{O}(n^2)$ preprocessing time to create a data structure of size $\tilde{O}(n^{1+\epsilon})$, such that subsequent EMD queries can be answered in $\tilde{O}(n)$ time, with approximation ratio $O(\alpha_X/\epsilon)$.

Our second result is an encoding scheme, which is a weaker form of sketching. In an encoding scheme, distributions are encoded, such that the EMD between two distributions can be estimated in *sub linear* time, given the encodings of the two distributions. In particular, given (X, d_X) , by using $\tilde{O}(n^2)$ preprocessing time, every subsequent distribution μ can be encoded into $F(\mu)$ in $\tilde{O}(n^{1+\epsilon})$ time. The query for EMD between μ and ν can be answered in $\tilde{O}(n^\epsilon)$ time, with approximation ratio $O(\alpha_X/\epsilon)$, given the two encodings $F(\mu)$ and $F(\nu)$.

The encoding scheme has immediate applications. In a 2-player game where 1 player knows μ and the other knows ν , there is a communication protocol with small communication complexity, through which the two players can approximate the EMD between

μ and ν . Another application is distance oracle, where we are given a metric (X, d_X) and s distributions $\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_s$ over X , we can use $\tilde{O}(n^2 + sn^{1+\epsilon})$ preprocessing time, creating a data structure of size $\tilde{O}(n^{1+\epsilon} + sn)$, such the query for EMD between μ_i and μ_j can be answered in $\tilde{O}(n^\epsilon)$ time, with approximation ratio $O(\alpha_X/\epsilon)$.

1 Introduction

Given a finite metric (X, d_X) and two multi-sets A, B of points in X with $|A| = |B| = N$, the *Earth-Mover distance* (or *EMD*) between A and B is defined as the minimum cost of a perfect matching, with respect to the cost function d_X , i.e:

$$EMD_X(A, B) = \min_{\pi: A \rightarrow B} \sum_{p \in A} \|d_X(a, \pi(a))\|$$

where π ranges over all one-to-one mappings.

The EMD metric is of significant importance in many applications. For example, in computer vision, EMD is used as a measurement for dissimilarity between two images. The idea is to represent an image as a distribution on features (such as colors and color spectrum), with an underlying metric. Then, the EMD of two distributions of features can be used for navigating image databases and image retrieve([20], [21], [22], [9], [10], [15]).

The exact distance can be computed in $O(N^3)$ time for general underlying metrics, using Hungarian method([18]). For metric supported by a sparse graph, there is a scaling algorithm due to [12] that runs in $O(\sqrt{|V|}|E| \log(|V|N))$ time. Better algorithms are known for special metrics. EMD over a 2-dimensional plane can be computed in

$O(N^{5/2} \log^{O(1)} N)$ time, due to Vaidya[23]. This time is further improved to $O(N^{2+\delta})$, for any $\delta > 0$, by Agarwal etc. [3].

Even for the special metric such as 2-dimensional plane, the exact EMD requires super-quadratic time, too expensive in many applications. This computational bottleneck motivates faster approximation algorithms. For the EMD over 2-dimensional plane, Agarwal and Varadarajan [24] showed $O(N^{3/2}/\epsilon^2 \log^5(N/\epsilon))$ time $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximation, then they gave an improved algorithm with $N^{1+\delta} \log^{O(1)} N$ -time and $\log(1/\delta)$ -approximation([2]). Indyk [14] further improved the running time to $O(N \log^{O(1)} N)$ for constant approximation. Following [14], Andoni etc. [4] provided a sketching algorithm with constant approximation.

There has also been special interest for embedding EMD into normed spaces. Charikar [8] showed that EMD over (X, d_X) can be embedded into l_1 space with distortion α , if (X, d_X) can be embedded into distribution of dominating trees with distortion α . Then, by [11], which showed α is at most $O(\log n)$ for a n -point metric, EMD over (X, d_X) with can be embedded into l_1 with distortion $O(\log n)$. Embedding into l_1 can give approximation algorithms, with the ratio equal to the distortion of the embedding. However, the embedding of EMD into l_1 has limitations : it has been showed in [19] that embedding of EMD over grid $[n]^2$ must incur a distortion of at least $\Omega(\sqrt{\log n})$.

In this paper, we are interested in approximating EMD over more general metrics: metrics with bounded doubling dimensions. The doubling dimension of a metric (X, d_X) is the smallest α such that every ball in X can be covered by 2^α balls of half the radius. This is a richer family of metrics than the constant-dimension Euclidean space. It can be shown, for example, for any fixed p , the doubling dimension of d -dimensional l_p is roughly d . On the other hand, [13] showed a family of metrics (G_k, d_k) with bounded doubling dimension, whose embedding into l_2 must incur a distortion of $\Omega(\sqrt{\log |G_k|})$. For a finite metric space X , $\alpha_X \leq \log |X|$. For many problems involving metrics, better results are known if the metrics have bounded doubling dimension. [16] obtained an $O(\sqrt{\alpha_X \log n})$ distortion embedding of X into l_2 , an improvement over Bourgain's theorem([1]) if the metric has low doubling dimension. [5] give better approximation algorithms for metric labeling and 0-extension for α -decomposable metrics(if a metric has doubling dimension α , it is $O(\alpha)$ -decomposable).

1.1 Our contribution

We study approximation algorithm for EMD over doubling metrics, a generalization of low dimensional Euclidean spaces. As far as we know, this is the first work to consider the EMD over this family of metrics. Our algorithm is a generalization of the algorithm in [14] for approximating EMD over planar grids. We defined a metric, called “sibling-linked hierarchical well-separated tree” metric, that the doubling metric can be embedded into with constant distortion. This metric has a nice property that the EMD over it is the sum of EMD over smaller metrics, which allows us to do “importance sampling”. In this paper, we also promoted a scheme called “encoding scheme”, a weaker form of the sketching scheme. In the encoding scheme, distributions are encoded in some form, and the EMD of two distributions can be approximated in *sub-linear* time, if the encodings of the two distributions are given. The sub-linear time estimation algorithm does the importance sampling in a binary-search way. using only logarithmic time.

Compared to the Euclidean spaces, there is an issue for doubling metrics on how the underlying metric is given. Reading the whole metric requires time quadratic in n , the size of the metric, while we're aiming for algorithms with time near linear in n . We avoid this bottleneck by preprocessing, in which our algorithms read the metric (X, d_X) and create a data structure of small size. By doing this, subsequent queries for EMD between μ and ν can be answered in time near linear in n .

Throughout, we use α_X to denote the doubling dimension of X . We assume each coordinate in a distribution can be represented in $\text{polylog}(n)$ bits. In particular, for a fixed constant number a , we define

$$\mathcal{P}_X = \left\{ \mu : X \rightarrow \left\{ 0, \frac{1}{n^a}, \frac{2}{n^a}, \dots, 1 \right\} \mid \sum_{p \in X} \mu_p = 1 \right\}$$

This restriction is only for simplicity of demonstration and doesn't affect our algorithms.

Our first result is an almost linear time, constant approximation algorithm for EMD over doubling metrics.

Theorem 1.1 (Approximation algorithm). *Let (X, d_X) be a metric space with $|X| = n$. Let $0 < \epsilon < 1$ be fixed. Given (X, d_X) and α_X , there is an algorithm which, by using $\tilde{O}(n^2)$ preprocessing time to create a data structure of size $\tilde{O}(n^{1+\epsilon})$, for any subsequent query for EMD between two distributions $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_X$, outputs in $\tilde{O}(n)$ time a random estimation D satisfy-*

ing

$$EMD_X(\mu, \nu) \leq D \leq O\left(\frac{\alpha_X}{\epsilon}\right) EMD_X(\mu, \nu) \quad (1)$$

with probability at least $2/3$. The probability is over the randomness for the preprocessing as well as the estimation.

The preprocessing time is quadratic in the size of the metric, which is unavoidable since we have to read the whole metric. However, the algorithm only reads the metric once, after which subsequent EMD queries can be answered in almost linear time in n . The probability $2/3$ can be amplified to $1 - \epsilon$, by repeating the algorithm $O(\log(1/\epsilon))$ times.

Unlike [4], our algorithm for theorem 1.1 is not sketching-based. Instead, we provide a weaker scheme, which we call “encoding scheme”. In the encoding scheme, distributions are encoded to l_1 vectors by an encoding function F . Given two encodings $F(\mu)$ and $F(\nu)$, there is a sub linear time algorithm approximating $EMD_X(\mu, \nu)$. The difference between an encoding and a sketch is, an encoding is not necessarily shorter than its pre-image.

Theorem 1.2 (Encoding scheme). *Let X, d_X, n, ϵ be as in theorem 1.1. Given (X, d_X) and α_X , there is an algorithm, which uses $\tilde{O}(n^2)$ preprocessing time to create a data structure of size $\tilde{O}(n^{1+\epsilon})$, such that for any subsequent query for $EMD_X(\mu, \nu)$, it can perform the following 3 steps:*

1. computes an encoding $F(\mu)$ of size $\tilde{O}(n)$ for μ in $\tilde{O}(n^{1+\epsilon})$ time, only reading μ and the data structure;
2. computes $F(\nu)$ similarly;
3. outputs a random number D satisfying (1) with probability $2/3$, in $\tilde{O}(n^\epsilon)$ time, only reading $F(\mu), F(\nu)$ and the data structure.

Notice that compared to the algorithm in theorem 1.1, the algorithm in theorem 1.2 requires $O(n^{1+\epsilon})$ time to approximate the EMD. The encoding scheme implies the following two theorems.

Theorem 1.3 (Communication protocol). *Let X, d_X, n, ϵ be as in theorem 1.1. Consider a game with two players Alice and Bob, in which Alice knows $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_X$ and Bob knows $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_X$. There exists a communication protocol with complexity $\tilde{O}(n^\epsilon)$, through which Alice and Bob can output a number D satisfying (1) with probability at least $2/3$.*

Theorem 1.3 suggests that proving a good lower bound for sketching using general communication complexity is impossible.

Theorem 1.4 (Distance oracle). *Let X, d_X, n, ϵ be stated as in theorem 1.1. Given (X, d_X) , α_X and s distributions $\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_s \in \mathcal{P}_X$, there is an algorithm which uses preprocessing time $\tilde{O}(n^2 + sn^{1+\epsilon})$ to construct a data structure of size $\tilde{O}(n^{1+\epsilon} + sn)$, and for any subsequent query for EMD between $\mu = \mu_i$ and $\nu = \mu_j$, outputs a number D in $\tilde{O}(n^\epsilon)$ time, satisfying (1) with probability at least $2/3$.*

1.2 Preliminaries

The doubling dimension α_X of a metric (X, d_X) is defined as the minimum t such that every ball in X can be covered using 2^t balls of half the radius. Define $R_X = \min p \in X \max q \in X d_X(p, q)$ to be the radius of X . When X is clear from the context, we may omit the subscript, using α, R instead. For a point $p \in X$ and a real number r , we use $Ball(p, r) = \{q : d_X(p, q) \leq r\}$ to denote the ball of radius r centered at p .

For two distributions $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_X$, the earth mover distance (EMD) between μ and ν is defined as

$$EMD_X(\mu, \nu) = \min_{\pi: X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}} \sum_{p, q \in X} d_X(p, q) \pi(p, q)$$

where π ranges over all functions π satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \forall p, q \in X, \pi(p, q) &\geq 0; \\ \forall p \in X, \sum_{q \in X} \pi(p, q) &= \mu_p; \\ \forall q \in X, \sum_{p \in X} \pi(p, q) &= \nu_q. \end{aligned}$$

We’ll use l_1 to denote the set of L_1 vectors of finite dimension, i.e $l_1 = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{R}^i$, equipped with L_1 norm. We’ll use $\oplus$ to denote the direct product operation. So, $x_1 \oplus x_2$ is the direct product of x_1 and x_2 , and $\bigoplus_{i=1}^s x_i$ is the direct product $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_s$.

The Cauchy distribution $\mathbb{C}(x_0, \gamma)$ is the distribution with the following probability density function : $f(x) = \frac{1}{\pi} \left(\frac{\gamma}{(x-x_0)^2 + \gamma^2} \right)$, where γ is called the scale parameter of the distribution. The cumulative distribution function of $\mathbb{C}(x_0, \gamma)$ is $F(x) = \frac{1}{\pi} \arctan \left(\frac{x-x_0}{\gamma} \right) + \frac{1}{2}$. Cauchy distribution is 1-stable distribution, meaning that the sum of n independent variables from $\mathbb{C}(0, 1)$ is $\mathbb{C}(0, n)$.

Throughout, we’ll use $\tilde{O}()$ notation to hide a factor of $\text{polylog}(n)$.

2 Overview of the algorithms

Our algorithms for theorem 1.1 and theorem 1.2 are only slightly different. We’ll describe the major com-

ponents of the algorithms here, and give the details in following sections.

In the preprocessing, we read (X, d_X) and decompose it into a distribution of so called *sibling-linked hierarchical well separated trees*, or SLHSTs, with distortion $O(\alpha/\epsilon)$, where ϵ is some parameter. The name is a little confusing since SLHST is actually not a tree (recall that even grids can not be embedded into distribution of trees with distortion $o(\log n)$). A SLHST is constructed by adding links connecting children of the same vertex (or siblings) to a base HST. In a HST, there is a unique path connecting two leaves. While in SLHST, we take a shortcut for this path: the two children of the last common ancestor of the two leaves are directly connected. A perfect analogy for this metric is the postal service system. In the postal service system with a hierarchy of post offices, a package is sent from a terminal to a local post office, and then to one with higher level in the hierarchy, and then to a even higher level, until it can be sent to an office of the same level. Then the package is sent to lower levels along the hierarchy system, until it reaches the destination.

Our embedding into distribution of SLHSTs is dominating, and has small distortion. Then, by a similar argument as the one in [8], the EMD over X can be approximated by the EMD over a random SLHST from the distribution. A nice property that a SLHST has is, the EMD over it can be represented as a sum of $O(n)$ EMDs over smaller sub metrics. Recall a special case in [14], the EMD over a grid of size n is the sum of EMDs over grids of smaller size.

The decomposition into smaller EMDs allows us to use the “importance sampling” technique, which is also used in [14]. Suppose we want to compute a sum $Z = \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i$, but it’s too expensive to compute all the Z_i s. We can choose a term Z_i with probability roughly proportional to how much it contributes to the sum. Then Z_i divided by this probability is used as the estimation for Z . The expectation of the value is Z , while the deviation depends on how well the sampling distribution approximates the weight distribution. Applying importance sampling to our case, we need a technique to approximate each EMD over a small metric up to a reasonable factor. This can be done using the embedding of metrics to distribution of dominating trees and then computing the EMD over the trees([11], [8]).

The above techniques provided us the main elements needed to prove theorem 1.1, while not enough to prove theorem 1.3. To get a sub-linear time estimation algorithm, we need to do the binary sampling more carefully. We invented a “binary impor-

tance sampling” process, which allows us to do the importance sampling in logarithmic time. The high level idea is to sample in a binary-search way. Recall in an importance sampling, we want to compute $Z = \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i$. We maintain a possible set S of terms, initially $[N]$. Each time the set S is divided into two equal subsets S_1 and S_2 , and then replaced with one of two subsets, with probability proportional to the weight of the subset. In $\log N$ steps, we end up with a single term in S , which is the term selected by the algorithm. This method requires us to estimate the sum of a subset of terms. In our case, each term can be approximated by the L_1 norm of a vector, so the total weight of a subset is the sum of L_1 norms, which is equivalent to one L_1 norm. We can use the sketch scheme in [17] to approximate the L_1 norm. For every potentially possible set S , we have a sketch for the concatenation of vectors in S . The sketch is linear, a crucial property allowing us to encode two distributions separately. We’ll describe the encoding function and the binary sampling algorithm in section 5.

3 Sibling-linked hierarchical well-separated trees

We introduce the definition of k -HST from [6] and then based on this definition, we define a k -SLHST.

Definition 3.1 (k -Hierarchical well-separated tree([6])). *A k -hierarchical well-separated tree(k -HST) is defined as a rooted weighted tree with the following properties:*

1. *The edge weight from any node to each of its children is the same;*
2. *The edge weights along any path from the root to a leaf are decreasing by a factor of at least k .*

We call k the scale-decreasing factor of the HST. For a tree k -HST τ , we use $V_\tau, U_\tau, deg(\tau)$ and $dep(\tau)$ to denote τ ’s vertices, non-leaf vertices, degree and depth, respectively. For some $v \in U_\tau$, let $\Lambda(v)$ be the set of v ’s children, $\Gamma(v)$ be the set of v ’s offspring leaves and Δ_v be the length of edges from v to its children.

Definition 3.2 (k -sibling-linked hierarchical well-separated tree). *Let τ be a k -HST. We associate each $v \in U_\tau$ a metric $d_v : \Lambda_v \times \Lambda_v \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying*

$$\forall u, w \in \Lambda(v), d_v(u, w) \leq 2\Delta_v \quad (2)$$

For some $v \in U_\tau$ and $u, w \in \Lambda(v)$, a sibling link (u, w) is an edge of length $d_v(u, w)$ connecting u and w . We call the graph obtained by combining τ and all the sibling links a k -sibling linked hierarchical well-separated tree (k -SLHST).

For a k -SLHST T , we use d_T to denote its shortest path metric. The notions such as $\text{dep}(\tau)$, $\text{deg}(\tau)$, Δ_v , Λ_v and Γ_v are naturally extended to k -SLHSTs. We say a SLHST T supports X if X is the leaves of T .

To avoid confusion, for a SLHST T that supports X , we always use p, q to denote points in X , as well as the leaves of T , and u, v to denote inner vertices in a SLHST, if possible.

3.1 Embedding X into a distribution of SLHSTs

Now, we are going to describe our algorithm for embedding metric (X, d_X) to a distribution of dominating SLHSTs. The algorithm is almost the same as the HST embedding algorithm in [11], except that we use $n^{1/\epsilon}$ as the scale-decreasing factor, instead of 2. The embedding is pretty bad (it will incur a distortion of $O(n^\epsilon)$). As we'll show, after we insert the sibling-links to the HST, the distortion becomes very small. We partition a set of radius R to clusters of radius r in $\log(R/r)$ steps and in each step we reduce the radius by a factor of 2.

Despite of its similarity with the tree embedding algorithm of [11], we give our algorithm here, for the integrality of the paper. Algorithm 1 partitions a metric Y into sets of smaller radius, and it will be used in by algorithm 2.

Algorithm 1 $\text{partition}(Y, d_Y, r)$

Input: A metric (Y, d_Y) and a scale r , r is guaranteed to be at least $R_Y/2$;

Output: A partition of Y into clusters of radius smaller than r : $\{Y_i : i \in [s]\}$

- 1: Select a $r/2$ -net $S \subset Y$;
 - 2: Randomly choose a permutation π for S and a number $\beta \in [1, 2)$
 - 3: **for** $i = 1, 2, \dots, |S|$ **do**
 - 4: $Y_i \leftarrow \text{Bally}_Y(\pi(i), \beta r/2) \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} Y_j$;
 - 5: **end for**
 - 6: **return** $\{Y_i : i \in [|S|], Y_i \neq \emptyset\}$
-

Claim 3.3. *The returned $\{Y_i : i \in s\}$ from algorithm 1 is indeed a partition, i.e., $\forall i \neq j, Y_i \cap Y_j = \emptyset$ and $\bigcup_{i \in [s]} Y_i = Y$.*

Claim 3.4. *The number of clusters that algorithm 1 returns is at most $(4R_Y/r)^{\alpha_Y} \leq 8^{\alpha_Y}$, for $r \geq R_Y/2$.*

Algorithm 2 describes how a SLHST is constructed. The tree is essentially a laminar tree of the X , where each vertex in the tree is correspondent to a subset of X . A vertex v_Y at level i (the root has level 0) has $\Delta_{v_Y} = r_i$, and is associated with a metric $d_{v_Y}(v_{Y'}, v_{Y''}) = d_X(c_{Y'}, c_{Y''}) + 4r_{i+1}$, where $c_{Y'}$ and $c_{Y''}$ are the centers chosen for Y' and Y'' respectively. The additive term $4r_{i+1}$ is to make sure that the SLHST metric is dominating.

Algorithm 2 $\text{embedding_into_SLHST}(X, d_X, \epsilon)$

Input: A metric (X, d_X) and $0 < \epsilon \leq 1/3$ such that $1/\epsilon$ is an integer;

Output: A SLHST T ;

- 1: $h \leftarrow \log R_X$;
 - 2: $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow \{X\}, \mathcal{C}' \leftarrow \emptyset, V_\tau = \{v_X\}, E_\tau \leftarrow \emptyset$;
 - 3: **for** $i \leftarrow 1, \dots, h$ **do**
 - 4: **for** Every $Y \in \mathcal{C}$ **do**
 - 5: $\mathcal{C}'' \leftarrow \text{partition}(Y, d_{X|Y}, 2^{h-i})$;
 - 6: **for** Every $Y' \in \mathcal{C}''$ **do**
 - 7: $V_\tau \leftarrow V_\tau + \{Y'\}, E_\tau \leftarrow E_\tau + \{(v_Y, v_{Y'})\}$
 - 8: **end for**
 - 9: $\mathcal{C}' \leftarrow \mathcal{C}' + \mathcal{C}''$;
 - 10: **end for**
 - 11: $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow \mathcal{C}', \mathcal{C}' \leftarrow \emptyset$;
 - 12: **end for**
 - 13: $a \leftarrow \lceil \epsilon \log n / \alpha_X \rceil, b \leftarrow \text{random integer from } [a]$;
 - 14: $L = \{i : 0 \leq i \leq h, i \equiv b \pmod{a}\} + \{0, h\}$;
 - 15: Shrink τ at level set L : we remove all level- i vertices for all $i \notin L$, and directly connect level- j vertices to their level- i ancestors using edges of length 2^{h-i} , for $i < j$ and i, j adjacent numbers in L ; let τ' be the new tree.
 - 16: Let $i < j$ be two adjacent numbers in L , for a level- i vertex v_Y and two level- j vertices $v_{Y'}, v_{Y''}$ whose parent in τ' is v_Y (so, $Y', Y'' \subset Y$), $d_{v_Y} = d_X(c_{Y'}, c_{Y''})$, where $c_{Y'}$ is the center of Y' (i.e., the radius of Y' is the maximum distance from $c_{Y'}$ to some other point in Y').
 - 17: **return** the SLHST T defined by τ' and d_{v_Y} s.
-

To avoid confusion, we use “rank” instead of “level” to denote the positions of vertices in τ, τ' and T . We say a vertex $v \in v_\tau$ has “rank” i , if the path from v to the root in τ contains i edges. The rank of a vertex in T (or τ') is just the rank of its correspondent vertex in τ . Notice that if some vertex $v \in U_T = U_{\tau'}$ has rank i , then $i \in L$.

Lemma 3.5. *The algorithm 2 actually returns a*

SLHST, i.e., the associated metrics satisfy equation (2). Furthermore, $\deg(T) \leq n^{O(\epsilon)}$.

Proof. Let $v_Y \in U_T$ be a rank i vertex and $v_{Y'}, v_{Y''}$ be two of its children in T . Notice that $v_{Y'}, v_{Y''}$ has the same rank j , where i and j are adjacent in L . Then $d_{v_Y}(v_{Y'}, v_{Y''}) = d_X(c_{Y'}, c_{Y''}) \leq 2R_Y \leq 2^{h-i+1} = 2\Delta_{v_Y}$.

The degree of τ is $2^{O(\alpha)}$, by claim 3.4. The shrinking operation collapses a levels into 1 level, and thus, the degree becomes at most $2^{O(\alpha)a} = 2^{O(\alpha)\lceil \epsilon \log n / \alpha \rceil} = n^{O(\epsilon)}$. $\square$

Lemma 3.6. *The random SLHST T that algorithm 2 returns supports X and satisfies:*

1. $\forall p, q \in X, d_T(p, q) \geq d_X(p, q);$
2. $\forall p, q \in X, \mathbb{E}_T[d_T(p, q)] \leq O(\alpha/\epsilon)d_X(p, q).$

Proof. Fix two points p and q . Let $v_Y, v_{Y'}$ be the two highest-rank vertices in the shortest path between p and q in T , and v be their parent. Let the rank of v_Y and $v_{Y'}$ be i . If $i = h$, clearly $d_T(p, q) = d_X(p, q)$; if $i < h$,

$$\begin{aligned} d_T(p, q) &\geq d_v(v_Y, v_{Y'}) \\ &= d_X(c_Y, c_{Y'}) + 2^{h-i+1} \\ &\geq d_X(p, q) - d_X(p, c_Y) - d_X(q, c_{Y'}) + 2^{h-i+1} \\ &\geq d_X(p, q) - 2^{h-i} - 2^{h-i} + 2^{h-i+1} \\ &= d_X(p, q); \end{aligned}$$

So, we've proved the first property.

Let P_i be the probability that p and q are separated at rank i in τ . Obviously, $\sum_{i=1}^h P_i = 1$, and from [11], we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^h P_i 2^{h-i} \leq O(\log n) d_X(p, q)$$

Now, we fix a tree τ . Suppose p and q are separated at rank i in τ . Let v_{Y_j} and $v_{Y'_j}$ be the rank j ancestors of p and q , respectively. If $i \leq h - a + 1$, p and q may be separated at rank $i, i+1, \dots, i+a-1$ in τ' , each with probability $1/a$. The expected $d_T(p, q)$, over all possible bs , denoted by D_i , is at most

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{a} \sum_{j=i}^{i+a-1} \left(d_X(c_{Y_j}, c_{Y'_j}) + 2 \sum_{j'=j}^{h-1} 2^{h-j'} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{a} \sum_{j=i}^{i+a-1} (d_X(p, q) + 2^{h-j} + 2^{h-j} + 4 \times 2^{h-j}) \\ &\leq d_X(p, q) + \frac{12}{a} 2^{h-i} \end{aligned}$$

If p and q are separated at rank i in τ , for some $i > h - a + 1$, D_i is at most

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{a} \left(\sum_{j=i}^h d_X(c_{Y_j}, c_{Y'_j}) + (i + a - 1 - h) d_X(p, q) \right) \\ &\leq d_X(p, q) + \frac{1}{a} \sum_{j=i}^h \left(2^{h-j} + 2^{h-j} + 2 \sum_{j'=j}^{h-1} 2^{h-j'} \right) \\ &\leq d_X(p, q) + \frac{12}{a} 2^{h-i} \end{aligned}$$

$\mathbb{E}[d_T(p, q)]$ Taking the expectation over τ and b , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_T[d_T(p, q)] &= \sum_{i=1}^h P_i D_i \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^h P_i \left(d_X(p, q) + \frac{12}{a} 2^{h-i} \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^h P_i d_X(p, q) + \frac{12}{a} \sum_{i=1}^h P_i 2^{h-i} \\ &\leq d_X(p, q) + \frac{12}{a} O(\log n) d_X(p, q) \\ &\leq O(\alpha/\epsilon) d_X(p, q) \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality comes from the fact that $a = \lceil \epsilon \log n / \alpha \rceil$. $\square$

3.2 Decomposition of EMD over a SLHST

Before showing the main lemma of this subsection, we introduce some notions.

Let T be a SLHST that supports X . For a distribution $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_X$ and a vertex $v \in U_T$, define $\mu_v = \sum_{p \in \Gamma(v)} \mu_p$ and $\hat{\mu}_v = \bigoplus_{u \in \Lambda(v)} \mu_u$. Define extended EMD (or EEMD) between $\hat{\mu}_v$ and $\hat{\nu}_v$ to be

$$\begin{aligned} EEMD_v(\hat{\mu}_v, \hat{\nu}_v) &= \min_{\pi: \Lambda_v \times \Lambda_v \rightarrow \mathbb{R}} EEMD_v^\pi(\hat{\mu}_v, \hat{\nu}_v) \\ EEMD_v^\pi(\hat{\mu}_v, \hat{\nu}_v) &= \sum_{u, w \in \Lambda_v} \pi(u, w) d_v(u, w) \\ &\quad + \Delta_v \left(\sum_{u \in \Lambda_v} \mu_u - \sum_{u, w \in \Lambda_v} \pi_{u, w} \right) \\ &\quad + \Delta_v \left(\sum_{w \in \Lambda_v} \nu_w - \sum_{u, w \in \Lambda_v} \pi_{u, w} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where π ranges over all transportation functions sat-

isfying

$$\begin{aligned} \forall u, w \in \Lambda_v, \pi(u, w) &\geq 0; \\ \forall u \in \Lambda_v, \sum_{w \in \Lambda_v} \pi(u, w) &\leq \mu_u; \\ \forall w \in \Lambda_v, \sum_{u \in \Lambda_v} \pi(u, w) &\leq \nu_w. \end{aligned}$$

The definition says that all the unmatched units must be sent to v .

Lemma 3.7.

$$EMD_T(\mu, \nu) = \sum_{v \in U_T} EEMD_v(\hat{\mu}_v, \hat{\nu}_v)$$

Proof sketch. We can view distributions μ and ν as supplies and demands on the leaves of the tree. The allowed operation is moving ϵ amount of supplies (or demands) along some edge (u, v) , which costs $\epsilon l(u, v)$. We can cancel out the same amount of supplies and demands on the same vertex for free. We can further restrict the moving direction, so that the moves can not go downwards.

We show that the best strategy is to match supplies and demands locally. i.e, it can not move supplies along (u, v) while moving demands along (w, v) , for some $v \in U_T$ and $u, w \in \Lambda_v$. Otherwise we would moving some amount of supplies directly from u to w and then match the same amount of demands at w . This will make the cost smaller, since $d_v(u, w) < \Delta_v + \Delta_v$. Thus, in the best matching, each vertex v will receive $\max(\mu_v - \nu_v, 0)$ amount of supplies and $\max(\nu_v - \mu_v, 0)$ amount of demands and cancels out all but $|\mu_v - \nu_v|$ amount of supplies or demands, which will be sent to its parent. This is exactly the sum of $EEMD_v$ s over all $v \in U_T$. $\square$

Lemma 3.8. *If X can be embedded into a set $\mathcal{Y}$ of dominating metrics, with distortion β , then, EMD_X can be embedded into $\{EMD_Y : Y \in \mathcal{Y}\}$, with distortion β .*

Proof. It's easy to see that EMD_Y dominates EMD_X . Let $\pi : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the best transportation function for $EMD_X(\mu, \nu)$, and $\psi : Y \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the best transportation function for $EMD_Y(\mu, \nu)$. By the definition of EMD, we have

$$\begin{aligned} EMD_X(\mu, \nu) &= \sum_{p, q \in X} \pi(p, q) d_X(p, q) \\ EMD_Y(\mu, \nu) &= \sum_{p, q \in X} \psi_Y(p, q) d_Y(p, q) \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}} EMD_Y(\mu, \nu) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sum_{p, q \in X} \psi_Y(p, q) d_Y(p, q) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sum_{p, q \in X} \pi(p, q) d_Y(p, q) \\ &= \sum_{p, q \in X} \pi(p, q) \mathbb{E}_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}} d_Y(p, q) \\ &\leq \sum_{p, q \in X} \pi(p, q) \beta d_X(p, q) \\ &\leq \beta EMD_X(\mu, \nu) \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Lemma 3.9. *If $\mathcal{T}$ be the distribution of dominating SLHSTs that $O(\alpha_X/\epsilon)$ -approximate X , then*

$$\begin{aligned} EMD_X(\mu, \nu) &\leq \mathbb{E}_{T \sim \mathcal{T}} \left(\sum_{v \in U_T} EEMD_{\Lambda_v}(\mu_v, \nu_v) \right) \\ &\leq O(\alpha_X/\epsilon) EMD_X(\mu, \nu) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. This lemma immediately follows lemma 3.7 and lemma 3.8. $\square$

4 Importance sampling, proof of theorem 1.1

After we decomposed EMD_X into $\sum_{v \in U_T} EEMD_v$, we'll use importance sampling to choose a element $v \in U_T$, as mentioned in section 2. The probability that v is selected should be roughly the ratio of $EEMD_v$ and EMD_T . The following lemma from [14] tells us how many samples are needed.

Lemma 4.1 ([14]). *Let $Z_1, \dots, Z_s \geq 0, Z = \sum_i Z_i$ and $q_i = Z_i/Z$. Let $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_s$ be some numbers satisfying $p_i \geq q_i/\gamma$ and $\sum_{i=1}^s p_i = 1$, for some $\gamma \geq 1$. Consider a random variable S such that $\Pr[S = Z_i/p_i] = p_i$; note that $E[S] = Z$. Then,*

$$\Pr \left[\left| \mathbb{E}_{i \in [M]} S_i - Z \right| > 0.5Z \right] \leq e^{-\Omega(M/\gamma)},$$

where $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_M$ are independent copies of S .

Proof. With probability 1,

$$0 \leq S \leq \max_{i \in [s]} \frac{Z_i}{p_i} = \max_{i \in [s]} \frac{Z q_i}{p_i} \leq \gamma Z$$

By Chernoff bound, we have

$$\Pr \left[\left| \mathbb{E}_{i \in [M]} S_i - Z \right| > 0.5Z \right] \leq e^{-\Omega(M/\gamma)}.$$

- 2. For every $v \in U_T$, $\min_{i \in [s]} EEMD_{\tau_{i,v}}(\hat{\mu}_v, \hat{\nu}_v) \leq O(\log n) EEMD_v(\hat{\mu}_v, \hat{\nu}_v)$;

To apply lemma 4.1, we need a way to approximate each $EEMD_v$ within a reasonable ratio. Embedding the metric d_v into distribution of trees can give an estimation that is always at least $EEMD_v$, and at most a logarithmic factor times $EEMD_v$ in expectation (see [8] and [11]). However, to allow a good estimation, the number of trees in the support should be $\Omega(|\Lambda_v|)$. Then, we need roughly $\sum_{v \in U_T} |\Lambda_v|^2 = O(n \max_v |\Lambda_v|)$ running time for the importance sampling, as opposed to $\tilde{O}(n)$ stated in the theorem. We can do slightly better by using the min of the EMDs, instead of the average.

Lemma 4.2. *Let (Y, d_Y) be a metric space such that $|Y| \leq n$, and $\mathcal{T}$ be a distribution of dominating trees that approximate (Y, d_Y) up to $O(\log n)$ factor, i.e., $\mathbb{E}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} d_\tau(p, q) \leq O(\log n) d_Y(p, q)$. If we randomly choose $s = O(\log n)$ trees $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_s$ from $\mathcal{T}$, then for every pair of distributions μ, ν over Y ,*

$$\min_{i \in [s]} EMD_{\tau_i}(\mu, \nu) \leq O(\log n) EMD_Y(\mu, \nu)$$

with probability at least $1 - 1/n$.

Proof. For 1 tree τ , with probability $1/2$, $EMD_\tau(\mu, \nu) \leq O(\log n) EMD_Y(\mu, \nu)$. So, with probability at least $1 - 1/n$, there exists a $i \in [s]$ satisfying $EMD_{\tau_i}(\mu, \nu) \leq O(\log n) EMD_Y(\mu, \nu)$. □

Now we can proceed to prove theorem 1.1.

Proof sketch of theorem 1.1. In the preprocessing, we run algorithm 2 to construct a SLHST T , with ϵ to be decided shortly. For each metric (Λ_v, d_v) associated with an inner vertex $v \in U_T$, we choose $s = O(\log n)$ dominating trees $\tau_{v,1}, \tau_{v,2}, \dots, \tau_{v,s}$ from the distribution of dominating trees that $O(\log n)$ -approximates d_v . The data structure includes T , all $\tau_{v,i}$ s and all sub-metrics of X restricted to Λ_v for $v \in U_T$.

The time to sample a SLHST is $\tilde{O}(n^2)$ and the time to compute all $\tau_{v,i}$ is still $\tilde{O}(n^2)$, implying the preprocessing time is $\tilde{O}(n^2)$.

The size of the data structure is $\tilde{O}(\sum_{v \in U_T} |\Lambda_v|^2) = n^{1+O(\epsilon)}$. The $|\Lambda_v|^2$ space is for small metrics d_v s and sub-metrics of d_X restricted to Λ_v s.

Let $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_X$ be the two distributions in the query.

With probability at least 0.9, the following two things happen:

1. $EMD_T = \sum_{v \in U_T} EEMD_v$ approximates EMD_X with approximation ratio $O(\alpha/\epsilon)$;

by lemma 3.9 and lemma 4.2.

Assuming the above two things happen, we can do the importance sampling, using $\min_{i \in [s]} EEMD_{\tau_{i,v}}(\hat{\mu}_v, \hat{\nu}_v)$ as the weight for v . The probability that v is selected in the importance sampling is at least $\frac{EEMD_v(\hat{\mu}_v, \hat{\nu}_v)}{O(\log n) EMD_T}$. So, by lemma 4.1, we only need $O(\log n)$ samples to approximate $EMD_T(\mu, \nu)$ up to a constant factor. This total time for importance sampling is $\tilde{O}(n)$, since $\sum_{v \in U_T} |\Lambda_v| = \tilde{O}(n)$.

Let v be a vertex selected by the importance sampling. We compute $EEMD_v(\hat{\mu}_v, \hat{\nu}_v)$ by using standard Hungarian algorithm. $|\Lambda_v|$ is at most $n^{O(\epsilon)}$, for small enough ϵ , computing $EEMD_v$ takes $o(n)$ time.

In all, with preprocessing time $O(n^2)$, data structure of size $\tilde{O}(n^{1+\epsilon})$, we can approximate $EMD_X(\mu, \nu)$ up to a $O(\alpha_X/\epsilon)$ factor in $\tilde{O}(n)$ time. Notice that we can remove the $O(\cdot)$ notion in the exponent, by losing a constant factor in the approximation ratio. □

5 Binary importance sampling, proofs of theorem 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4

In this section, we describe an encoding scheme, where each distribution μ is encoded into a linear code $F(\mu)$ and $EMD_X(\mu, \nu)$ can be approximated using sub-linear time, when $F(\mu)$ and $F(\nu)$ are given.

Recall that, in the algorithm for theorem 1.1, we need to do the importance sampling, where we estimate $EEMD_v$ for every $v \in T$. To design a sub-linear estimation time algorithm, we must avoid estimating $EEMD_v$ for every v .

This can be done by using a binary sampling method where, we maintain a set S of possible outputs, initially U_T and during each iteration, set S is divided into 2 equal subsets, and replaced with one of the subset with probability proportional to the weight of the subset. The process repeats $O(\log n)$ times, until there's only 1 element left in S , which is the output of the importance sampling.

The above method requires a good estimation for the total weight of a subset. In section 4, we used the min of l_1 norms as the estimation for the weight of an element. Then the total weight of a subset is the sum of mins, which seems hard to estimate. We'll use a different estimation : the sum of l_1 norms,

which is still a l_1 norm. The total weight of a subset is again the sum of l_1 norms, equivalent to a l_1 norm. There are good sketching schemes for l_1 metric, for example, [17] used a random linear map $g : l_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ as the sketching of a l_1 vector, such that the L_1 norm of x is approximated by the median of $|g_1(x)|, |g_2(x)|, \dots, |g_k(x)|$, where g_i is the i -th coordinate of g . In the sketch function, each g_i is a linear function of x , where the linear coefficients are chosen from the Cauchy distribution of scale parameter 1. i.e $g_i = \sum_j \alpha_j x_j, \alpha_j \sim \mathbb{C}(0, 1)$. The value k determines how well the norm is approximated, as in lemma 5.2. Before giving the lemma, we first define:

Definition 5.1 (ρ -good). *For some $0 < \rho < 0.1$, we say the sketch function g is ρ -good for a fixed x , if*

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \rho)|x|_1 &\leq \text{median}(|g_1(x)|, |g_2(x)|, \dots, |g_k(x)|) \\ &\leq (1 + \rho)|x|_1 \end{aligned}$$

where $g_1, g_2, \dots, g_k$ are k coordinates of g .

Lemma 5.2. *Let $g : l_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ be the l_1 sketch function, with $k = c/\rho^2$ for some $0 < \rho < 0.1$ and integer c . Then, for a fixed $x \in l_1$, g is ρ -good with probability at least $1 - e^{-\Omega(c)}$.*

We leave the proof of lemma 5.2 to the appendix. For a set of N elements, we fix a binary sampling tree, where each node is a subset of $[N]$. A set is equal to the union of its two child sets of half the size. The root of the tree is $[N]$, and the N leaves are $\{1\}, \{2\}, \dots, \{N\}$. Let $\mathcal{S}_N$ be the family of all subsets of $[N]$ in this binary sampling tree; notice that $|\mathcal{S}_N| = O(N)$, and $\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_N} |S| = \tilde{O}(N)$. Our encoding $f : (l_1)^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{O(Nk)}$ is defined as

$$f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) = \bigoplus_{S \in \mathcal{S}_N} g \left(\bigoplus_{i \in S} x_i \right). \quad (3)$$

Algorithm 3 is the binary importance sampling algorithm. It takes the encoding f for N vectors in l_1 , and selects a number $i \in [N]$, with probability supposed to be $|x_i| / \sum_{j \in [N]} |x_j|$.

Claim 5.3. P_t is the probability that algorithm 3 selects t , as stated.

Definition 5.4 (successful). *We say a encoding f is successful for fixed $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N$, if algorithm 3 selects t with probability at least $0.5 |x_t|_1 / \left| \bigoplus_{i=1}^N x_i \right|_1$.*

Lemma 5.5. *Let $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N$ be fixed. If all occurrences of g in the encoding f are $1/(10 \log N)$ -good, f is successful.*

Algorithm 3 *b_import_sample*($f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$)

Input: Encoding f for N vectors $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N$;

Output: A pair (t, P_t) , where $t \in [N]$ and P_t is the probability that the algorithm selects t ;

- 1: $S \leftarrow [N], P \leftarrow 1$;
 - 2: **while** $|S| > 1$ **do**
 - 3: Let S_1 and S_2 be the two children of S in the binary sampling tree;
 - 4: Extract $\hat{g}^1 = g \left(\bigoplus_{j \in S_1} x_j \right)$ and $\hat{g}^2 = g \left(\bigoplus_{j \in S_2} x_j \right)$ from the encoding f ;
 - 5: $W_1 \leftarrow \text{median}(|\hat{g}_1^1|, |\hat{g}_2^1|, \dots, |\hat{g}_k^1|)$ and $W_2 \leftarrow \text{median}(|\hat{g}_1^2|, |\hat{g}_2^2|, \dots, |\hat{g}_k^2|)$;
 - 6: Let i be 1 with probability $\frac{W_1}{W_1 + W_2}$ and 2 with probability $\frac{W_2}{W_1 + W_2}$;
 - 7: $S \leftarrow S_i, P \leftarrow P \times \frac{W_i}{W_1 + W_2}$;
 - 8: **end while**
 - 9: **return** (t, P) where t is the unique element in S ;
-

Proof. If all occurrences of g in f are $1/(10 \log N)$ -good, the median of absolute values of the sketch will always give the l_1 norm of the pre-image, up to a factor of $1 \pm 1/(10 \log N)$. Thus the probability that algorithm 3 selects t is at least

$$\left(\frac{1 - \frac{1}{10 \log N}}{1 + \frac{1}{10 \log N}} \right)^{\log N} \frac{|x_t|_1}{\left| \bigoplus_{i=1}^N x_i \right|_1} > 0.5 \frac{|x_t|_1}{\left| \bigoplus_{i=1}^N x_i \right|_1},$$

where the exponent $\log N$ comes from the depth of the binary sampling tree. By definition 5.4, f is successful. $\square$

Then we apply algorithm 3 to compute the EMD over a SLHST metric. As shown in lemma 3.7, EMD over a SLHST T is the sum of $EEMD_v$ s over all $v \in U_T$. Each underlying metric d_v can be embedded into distribution of dominating trees, with distortion logarithmic in the size of the metric. In order to make the preprocessing efficient, we need a small set of dominating trees. [7] gives exactly what we want :

Theorem 5.6 ([7]). *Given a metric (X, d_X) with $|X| = n$, there is a set of $O(n \log n)$ dominating trees and a probability on them, such that the metric d_X is approximated by the set of dominating tree metrics, with distortion $O(\log n \log \log n)$. Moreover, there is a polynomial algorithm which gives the set and the probability.*

Then, by lemma 3.8 (or [8]), the EEMD over (v, d_v) can be embedded into the average EEMD

of $O(|\Lambda_v| \log |\Lambda_v|)$ trees, which is equivalent to the norm of a $(|\Lambda_v|^2 \log |\Lambda_v|)$ dimensional L_1 , with distortion $O(\log |\Lambda_v| \log \log |\Lambda_v|)$. We use $h_v : \mathbb{R}^{\Lambda(v)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{O}(|\Lambda(v)|^2)}$ to denote the linear function whose l_1 norm approximates $EEMD_v$.

For a SLHST T , let's list all the vertices in U_T : $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_N$. Define :

$$F_T(\mu) = f(h_{v_1}(\hat{\mu}_{v_1}), \dots, h_{v_N}(\hat{\mu}_{v_N})) \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in [N]} \hat{\mu}_{v_i} \quad (4)$$

Then, algorithm 4 shows how to approximate the EMD in sub linear time, if the encodings are given.

Algorithm 4 *approx_EMD($T, F_T(\mu), F_T(\nu)$)*

- 1: $Sum \leftarrow 0$;
 - 2: Extract $f_\mu = f(h_{v_1}(\hat{\mu}_{v_1}), \dots, h_{v_N}(\hat{\mu}_{v_N}))$ from $F_T(\mu)$, and $f_\nu = f(h_{v_1}(\hat{\nu}_{v_1}), \dots, h_{v_N}(\hat{\nu}_{v_N}))$ from $F_T(\nu)$;
 - 3: **for** $i \leftarrow 1, 2, \dots, \lceil \log^2 n \rceil$ **do**
 - 4: $(t, P) = \text{bimport_sample}(f_\mu - f_\nu)$;
 - 5: Extract $\hat{\mu}_{v_t}$ from $F_T(\mu)$ and $\hat{\nu}_{v_t}$ from $F_T(\nu)$;
 - 6: $Sum \leftarrow Sum + EEMD_{v_t}(\hat{\mu}_{v_t}, \hat{\nu}_{v_t})/P$;
 - 7: **end for**
 - 8: **return** $Sum/\lceil \log^2 n \rceil$.
-

Lemma 5.7. *If all occurrences of f in $F_T(\mu - \nu) = F_T(\mu) - F_T(\nu)$ are successful, algorithm 4 outputs a number between $0.5EMD_T(\mu, \nu)$ and $1.5EMD_T(\mu, \nu)$ with probability at least 0.9.*

Proof. If all occurrence of f in $F_T(\mu - \nu)$ are successful, algorithm 3 chooses t with probability at least

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{0.5h_t(\hat{\mu}_t, \hat{\nu}_t)}{\sum_{i \in [N]} h_{v_i}(\hat{\mu}_i, \hat{\nu}_i)} \\ & \geq \frac{0.5EEMD_t(\hat{\mu}_t, \hat{\nu}_t)}{O(\log n \log \log n) \sum_{i \in [N]} EEMD_i(\hat{\mu}_i, \hat{\nu}_i)} \\ & = \frac{1}{O(\log n \log \log n)} \frac{EEMD_t(\hat{\mu}_t, \hat{\nu}_t)}{EMD_T(\mu, \nu)} \end{aligned}$$

By lemma 4.1, the probability that the algorithm outputs a number between $0.5EMD_T(\mu, \nu)$ and $1.5EMD_T(\mu, \nu)$ is at least

$$1 - e^{-\Omega(\log^2 n / \log n \log \log n)} \geq 0.9.$$

□

Proof sketch of theorem 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4. We first prove theorem 1.2, and then show how this it implies theorem 1.3 and 1.4.

The preprocessing stage is almost the same as the algorithm for theorem 1.1, except that we choose $s =$

$O(|\Lambda_v| \log |\Lambda_v|)$ dominating trees $\tau_{v,1}, \tau_{v,2}, \dots, \tau_{v,s}$ for v using the algorithm in [7]. The preprocessing time is $\tilde{O}(n^2)$, and the size of the data structure is $O(n^{1+\epsilon})$.

We can suppose we have EMD_T approximates EMD_X with $O(\alpha_X/\epsilon)$ distortion, because this happens with high probability.

Then we compute the encoding $F_T(\mu)$ and $F_T(\nu)$ using formulas (3) and (4). The time to compute f is k times the dimension of the input, which is $\sum_{v \in U_T} \tilde{O}(|\Lambda_v|^2) = O(n^{1+\epsilon})$ in $F_T(\mu)$. The second part of $F_T(\mu)$ can be ignored. The time to compute the encoding is $\tilde{O}(kn^{1+\epsilon})$. The size of the encoding is $O(Nk) = \tilde{O}(nk)$.

If we set k to $O(\log^3 n)$, then by lemma 5.2, every occurrence of g is $O(1/\log n)$ -good with probability $1 - O(1/n^4)$. Totally, there are $\tilde{O}(|U_T|) = \tilde{O}(n)$ occurrences of g in $F_T(\mu - \nu)$, thus, with probability $1 - O(1/n^3)$, every occurrence of g is $O(1/\log n)$ -good, which implies, by lemma 5.5, $f(h_{v_1}(\hat{\mu}_{v_1}), \dots, h_{v_N}(\hat{\mu}_{v_N}))$ is successful. This finally implies algorithm will output a number between $0.5EMD_T(\mu, \nu)$ and $1.5EMD_T(\mu, \nu)$ with probability at least 0.9, by lemma 5.7. The number $O(\alpha_X/\epsilon)$ -approximates $EMD_X(\mu, \nu)$.

Since $k = O(\log^3 n)$, the time need to compute an encoding is $\tilde{O}(kn^{1+\epsilon}) = \tilde{O}(n^{1+\epsilon})$, and the size of an encoding is $\tilde{O}(nk) = \tilde{O}(n)$. The binary importance sampling takes time $\tilde{O}(1)$, The bottleneck of algorithm 4 is computing the $EEMD_v$ s, which takes total time $\tilde{n}^{O(\epsilon)}$. In algorithm 4, we don't really compute $F_T(\mu - \nu)$. As the encoding is linear, whenever we want to read a number from $F_T(\mu - \nu)$, we read the numbers in $F_T(\mu)$ and $F_T(\nu)$ and then do the subtraction.

Theorem 1.2 immediately implies theorem 1.3. Alice computes $F(\mu)$ and Bob computes $F(\nu)$, then, they communicate to simulate algorithm 4. The communication complexity is $O(n^\epsilon)$, with approximation ratio α_X/ϵ .

For theorem 1.4, we can store the encodings for all the s distributions in the preprocessing stage and when a query comes, run algorithm 4. We can run the preprocessing stage $O(\log s)$ times independently and store $O(\log s)$ data structures so that with high probability, the EMD between every pair is reserved.

□

6 Conclusions

We have demonstrated a almost linear algorithm for estimating EMD over doubling metrics up to a constant factor. We also derived an encoding-based sub-

linear time constant approximation algorithm, which may have further applications.

An interesting direction to pursue would be to find a sketching scheme for EMD over doubling metrics. [4]’s sketching scheme benefits from the fact that all the small grids are the same. While in our case, the small metrics are different. If we can embed the EMD over the small metrics to any uniform normed space up to a constant factor, we can use the technique in [4] to derive a sketch scheme.

References

- [1] On lipschitz embedding of finite metric spaces in hilbert space. *Journal Israel Journal of Mathematics*, pages 46–52, 1985.
- [2] Pankaj Agarwal and Kasturi Varadarajan. A near-linear constant-factor approximation for euclidean bipartite matching? In *SCG ’04: Proceedings of the twentieth annual symposium on Computational geometry*, pages 247–252, New York, NY, USA, 2004. ACM.
- [3] Pankaj K. Agarwal, Alon Efrat, and Micha Sharir. Vertical decomposition of shallow levels in 3-dimensional arrangements and its applications. In *SCG ’95: Proceedings of the eleventh annual symposium on Computational geometry*, pages 39–50, New York, NY, USA, 1995. ACM.
- [4] Alexandr Andoni, Khanh Do Ba, Piotr Indyk, and David Woodruff. Efficient sketches for earth-mover distance, with applications. 2009.
- [5] Aaron Archer, Jittat Fakcharoenphol, Chris Harrelson, Robert Krauthgamer, Kunal Talwar, and Éva Tardos. Approximate classification via earthmover metrics. In *SODA ’04: Proceedings of the fifteenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 1079–1087, Philadelphia, PA, USA, 2004. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- [6] Yair Bartal. Probabilistic approximation of metric spaces and its algorithmic applications. In *In 37th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 184–193, 1996.
- [7] Moses Charikar, Chandra Chekuri, Ashish Goel, Sudipto Guha, and Serge Plotkin. Approximating a finite metric by a small number of tree metrics. In *FOCS ’98: Proceedings of the 39th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, page 379, Washington, DC, USA, 1998. IEEE Computer Society.
- [8] Moses S. Charikar. Similarity estimation techniques from rounding algorithms. In *STOC ’02: Proceedings of the thirty-fourth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 380–388, New York, NY, USA, 2002. ACM.
- [9] Scott Cohen and Leonidas Guibas. The earth mover’s distance: Lower bounds and invariance under translation. Technical report, Stanford, CA, USA, 1997.
- [10] Scott Cohen and Leonidas Guibas. The earth mover’s distance under transformation sets. In *ICCV ’99: Proceedings of the International Conference on Computer Vision-Volume 2*, page 1076, Washington, DC, USA, 1999. IEEE Computer Society.
- [11] Jittat Fakcharoenphol, Satish Rao, and Kunal Talwar. A tight bound on approximating arbitrary metrics by tree metrics. In *STOC ’03: Proceedings of the thirty-fifth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 448–455, New York, NY, USA, 2003. ACM.
- [12] H. N. Gabow and R. E. Tarjan. Faster scaling algorithms for network problems. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 18(5):1013–1036, 1989.
- [13] A. Gupta, R. Krauthgamer, and J. R. Lee. Bounded geometries, fractals, and low-distortion embeddings. In *44th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 534–543, October 2003.
- [14] Piotr Indyk. A near linear time constant factor approximation for euclidean bichromatic matching (cost). In *SODA ’07: Proceedings of the eighteenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 39–42, Philadelphia, PA, USA, 2007. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- [15] Piotr Indyk and Nitin Thaper. Fast color image retrieval via embeddings. Technical report, 2003.
- [16] R. Krauthgamer, J. R. Lee, M. Mendel, and A. Naor. Measured descent: A new embedding method for finite metrics. In *45th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 434–443. IEEE, October 2004.
- [17] Eyal Kushilevitz, Rafail Ostrovsky, and Yuval Rabani. Efficient search for approximate nearest neighbor in high dimensional spaces, 1998.

- [18] Eugene Lawler. *Combinatorial Optimization: Networks and Matroids*. Saunders College Publishing, Fort Worth, 1976.
- [19] Assaf Naor and Gideon Schechtman. Planar earthmover is not in L1 . In *In 47th Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, page 0509074, 2006.
- [20] Yossi Rubner, Leonidas Guibas, and Carlo Tomasi. The earth movers distance, multi-dimensional scaling, and color-based image retrieval. In *in Proceedings of the ARPA Image Understanding Workshop*, pages 661–668, 1997.
- [21] Yossi Rubner, Carlo Tomasi, and Leonidas J. Guibas. The earth mover’s distance as a metric for image retrieval. Technical report, Stanford, CA, USA, 1998.
- [22] Yossi Rubner, Carlo Tomasi, and Leonidas J. Guibas. A metric for distributions with applications to image databases. In *ICCV ’98: Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Computer Vision*, page 59, Washington, DC, USA, 1998. IEEE Computer Society.
- [23] Pravin Vaidya. Geometry helps in matching. In *STOC ’88: Proceedings of the twentieth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 422–425, New York, NY, USA, 1988. ACM.
- [24] Kasturi R. Varadarajan and Pankaj K. Agarwal. Approximation algorithms for bipartite and non-bipartite matching in the plane. In *SODA ’99: Proceedings of the tenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 805–814, Philadelphia, PA, USA, 1999. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.

For some $0 < \delta < 0.1$, define $Y_i = 1$ if $g_i < F^{-1}(1/2 - \delta)$ or $g_i > F^{-1}(1/2 + \delta)$ and 0 otherwise. Using Chernoff bound, we have

$$\Pr \left[\sum_{i=1}^k Y_i \geq k/2 \right] \leq e^{-\delta^2 k/8}$$

If $k = c/\delta^2$, the above probability is at most $e^{-\Omega(c)}$. For small enough δ , $F^{-1}(1/2 - \delta) = (1 - \Theta(\delta))\gamma$ and $F^{-1}(1/2 + \delta) = (1 + \Theta(\delta))\gamma$. $\sum_{i=1}^k Y_i < n/2$ implies the absolute median falls between $(1 - O(\delta))\gamma$ and $(1 + O(\delta))\gamma$. $\square$

A Proof of lemma 5.2

Proof. For a fixed x and $i \in [k]$, the distribution of $g_i(x)$ is $\mathbb{C}(0, |x|_1)$. Let $\gamma = |x|_1$, and

$$f(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } t < 0 \\ \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{\gamma}{t^2 + \gamma^2} & \text{if } t \geq 0 \end{cases}$$

be the probability density function $|g_i|_s$. F is the correspondent cumulative function :

$$F(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } t < 0 \\ \frac{2}{\pi} \arctan\left(\frac{t}{\gamma}\right) & \text{if } t \geq 0 \end{cases}$$